R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 741 FL 000 282

NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE FOR FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN (CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE, JUNE 20 TO AUGUST 12, 1966). FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT.

BY- MCKIM, LESTER W.
CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLL., ELLENSBURG

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.72 68P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS (SCHOOL), *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *LEADERSHIP TRAINING, *SUPERVISORS, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, WASHINGTON, NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTES, ELLENSBURG

THE PROGRAM OF ADVANCED TRAINING FOR 50 FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN AND CITY COORDINATORS WHO ATTENDED THE FIRST NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE IS DESCRIBED. HIGHLIGHTING THE UNIQUE FEATURE OF THE CURRICULUM WHICH WAS ITS ORGANIZATION AROUND TOPICS RATHER THAN COURSES, THE REPORT LISTS THE 40 LECTURE TOPICS, PRESENTED BY BOTH STAFF AND VISITING CONSULTANTS, RELATED TO CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, SUPERVISORY TECHNIQUES, INSERVICE TRAINING, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, TESTING, TEACHING CULTURE, AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS. THE REPORT DESCRIBES THE SMALL AND LARGE GROUP SCHEDULING, INDIVIDUAL STUDY ACTIVITIES, COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION FOR THE STUDY OF SPECIAL PROBLEMS, DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTICAL PROJECTS BY PARTICIPANTS, OBSERVATION OF DEMONSTRATIONS, AND INFORMAL DISCUSSION OF PROFESSIONAL MATTERS WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS. INCLUDED TOO ARE PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE, A DIRECTORY OF ATTENDEES, THE LECTURE SCHEDULE, AND SAMPLES OF FORMS USED IN CONDUCTING THE INSTITUTE. (AM)

ED011741

NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

FINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL 000 282

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

SUMMER 1966

FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT
ON THE INSTITUTE FOR Foreign Language Supervisors and

Department Chairmen CODE 1-2

AT: Central Washington State College
(Name of institution)

DATES: (From) June 20, 1966

(To) August 12, 1966

SUBMITTED BY: Lester W. McKim
(Director)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page 1. Table of Contents
2. Introducation
3. Special Report
5. Evaluation: Introduction
5. Evaluation: Program
13. Evaluation: Administration
17. Evaluation: Staff
18. Evaluation: Participants
21. List of appendices

INTRODUCTION

The NDEA Foreign Language Leadership at Central Washington State College this summer was the first of its kind. My personal conviction that such institutes are badly needed was strengthened by this experience. There is an obvious need for stronger leadership among foreign language teachers and supervisors and a lack of training programs.

I hope this report is more than a normal institute report. The Institute staff members and I have analyzed our experiences quite thoroughly in order to provide guidelines for future directors of similar institutes and for ourselves.

SPECIAL REPORT

This section of the final Institute report consists of a list of recommendations which summarize the feelings of the Institute staff and participants. Most of these recommendations are found in the body of the Institute Evaluation which follows. They follow the order of the items listed in the May 10 memo "Technical Report" and assume that the Institute might be repeated.

1. Suggestions and materials received from the USOE were most helpful. Close contacts should be maintained with the FL specialists of that Office.

2. Institutional policies which affect an NDEA Institute should be thoroughly reviewed with local administrators. Items to receive special attention are pay for the Institute secretary, additional secretarial equipment, and grades for participants. (Hopefully, an "S"/"U" system might be used.)

3. A three-day pre-Institute staff conference should be held soon after participants have been selected and notified. Publicity and selection procedures used this year should be repeated.

4. More careful attention should be given to participant oreintation during the opening days of the Institute.

5. The same, or similar, facilities used this year should be used again, with provision for the use of a special room for showing films.

6. Not applicable.

7. Staff members and participants should be housed in the same dormitory and a representative group of participants should be organized as ways to keep lines of communication open.

8. All instructional staff members should be full-time and of the same number as this year. The clerical staff should be enlarged by two during the period of the Institute.

9. Unless there is a member of the regular faculty with the varied background of training and experience needed for this Institute, visiting faculty members should be used, as this year.

10. There should be five visiting lecturers, as there were this year, but one should be invited for three days for a special leadership-training workshop. Where ratings are unfavorable, substitutions should be made for lecturers used this year. All lecturers should be urged to prepare carefully for their series. Publishing company consultants should not be invited. Presentations of materials should be done by participants.

11. Most of the unique features of the Institute should be repeated. These include various committee assignments, some with and some without staff advisers; large group lectures followed by small group discussions; individual projects; special planning for visiting lecturers; and a topic-oriented program.

12. We should continue acquiring relevant materials for the materials center. Through the examination of those materials and through special participant reports, participants should be made aware of the great potential of new media. Special instruction in the use of videotapes should be included in the Institute program.

13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. Not applicable.

18. Staff members and participants should be involved in solving Institute problems and in making plans for adjustments in the program.

19. a. Objectives should remain the same.

b. Once again, all grade levels should be represented.

c. The Institute should begin one week later

d. The period of the Institute should last seven rather than eight weeks.

e. Once again, there should be fifty participants, with a limit of one for any single school system.

f. The code should remain 1 and 2.

g. and h. The same as this year.

j. The budget total should be about the same, although there would have to be internal adjustments to allow for additional clerical help and supplies.

EVALUATION

This section is divided into four parts: program, administration, staff, and participants. The topics suggested in the memo of May 10, 1966, (Technical Report) are considered in this section, but not in the order listed.

During the final week of the Institute, an extensive questionnaire was completed by all participants, computed by the Institute secretary, and analyzed by the Institute Director and one staff member, Dr. Frederick Eddy. The first part of the questionnaire was not signed. Although space was left for comments, that part remained essentially objective. Each participant signed the second part, dealing with his own future plans, and submitted it separately. The entire questionnaire and the tabulation of ratings or responses are found in the Appendix of this report. Ratings represent an average of the total number of participants responding to any item.

I have used the following format for discussing each of the four main topics: First, the objective data from the evaluation questionnaire are analyzed. Second, a selection of favorable and unfavorable participant comments is included. And third, the topic is discussed in some detail. Following the ending of the Institute, the Institute staff and I spent several hours discussing the final report. Consequently, it reflects the thinking of the entire staff.

PROGRAM: The program was the key to the success or failure of the Institute. There were so many special features that it is difficult to discuss any part of the Institute without referring to the program. For that reason, I am beginning with the program.

Sections A, B, and C of the evaluation questionnaire are related to the program. In those sections, there are twenty-four items requiring a 5 to 0 rating. The range of the tabulated ratings was from 3.3 to 4.7. Fourteen of the ratings were 4.0 or better, and ten were between 3.3 and 3.9. The average for the twenty-four items was 4.0. Reactions to items 16, 18, and 19 constitute a strong endorsement of the program organization.

Items 20 and 22 suggest changes that should be considered in planning another institute. Participants were overwhelmingly in favor of a period devoted to general leadership training conducted by a specialist in that field. Several specialists were mentioned who normally work with junior business executives but who also work with educators. They were also in favor of shortening the Institute. One-half favored six weeks and one-half a longer period. The staff felt that a seven-week institute would be easier for super-

visors to attend; they felt, however, that the loss of more time would seriously jeopardize the program.

Strongest participant ratings were given Institute objectives, individual study time, and personal projects. Weakest ratings were given staff lectures, presentations by publishing company consultants, and instruction related to applied psychology.

The most frequent comment made by participants expressed a realization of personal need for additional study, personal and formal, and an appreciation of information that will facilitate such study. A few examples are listed here.

"This Institute has opened my eyes to the many things I need to read, study, promote, and evaluate."
"I am determined to continue my study of French and Spanish."
"I plan to add professional journals to my list of musts, for example, the Modern Language Journal and the PMLA."
"If the Institute has not given me all the answers I wanted, it has supplied me with information of sources where many answers can be found."
"I have acquired a most interesting and useful bibliography."
"The greatest benefit came to me from the reading program."

There was a wide expression of personal growth. The following remarks are typical.

"My job goals and responsibilities have been clarified."
"After the informal discussions I have had with other participants during this Institute, I have heard of so many varied problems that I will not be so apt to consider my own to be of crisis proportion in the future."
"The Institute has helped to clarify in my mind the role the supervisor should have in the school curriculum."
"The goals for my program and for myself have become much more definite and clear."
"I feel that I will be more effective in class visitations, committee organizations, and workshop direction."
"Perhaps the greatest Institute achievement is the loss of the defensiveness which has, to a large degree, characterized my approach in the past."
"This Institute has provided a wonderful opportunity to meet people from all over the country and to learn first-hand of what is happening in other areas."
"As a human being working in groups and with groups, I hope I have learned something of lasting value."
"This Institute helped me identify my strengths and weaknesses, and showed me concrete ways to improve myself."
"I have been shown the importance of organizing my thinking, of editing my writings, and of being more self-critical."

"One of the highlights of the Institute has been the experience of meeting top people in fields related to FL teaching."

Some comments indicated specific strengthening of information relative to administrative work.

"I have gotten new concepts in scheduling and organizing classes."
"I am more determined than ever before to push for four-year sequences in all foreign languages."
"An important concept I have gained is that of the importance of cross-disciplinary teaching in foreign languages."
"One of the most significant values of the Institute was the constant relating and integrating of what otherwise might be treated as separate subjects."
"I have a much deeper understanding of FLES."
"I have gotten excellent ideas on how to go about interpreting the goals of FL teaching."

Numerous specific activities were singled out for comment. For example:

"I have studied linguistics at two previous Institutes, but I was never fully convinced of the practical value of linguistics to classroom teaching. After the lectures and discussions here, I have changed my mind."
"I have received meaningful help in planning electronic classrooms."
"My knowlege of and skill in using such AV aids as an overhead projector and tape dubbing equipment have been greatly strengthened."
"The work of the topic committees will be invaluable to me in the future."
"The topic committee was one of the finest experiences. I learned much about working with a group."

Naturally, not all comments were favorable. Most of the following comments represent general feeling; a few are either personal or represent a minority opinion.

"The small group discussions could have been strengthened by an avoidance of trivia."
"I think the presentations by publishing company consultants was a waste of time becuase these people are so readily available outside the Institute."
"There were too many committee assignments for each person."
"Some leadership problems were brought up, but very sketchily dealt with."
"More time should have been spent on developing broad guidelines for leadership."
"The Institute program was much too general."

"There should be a chance for every participant to act as a leader of a group at least one time during the Institute."

"More trips should have been organized for the entire group."

"Eight weeks is too long for an Institute of this kind. Supervisors have difficulty being away that long. Material would have to be limited even more, but the gain would be greater than the loss."

"Some of the visiting lecturers obviously made no special preparation for this Institute. They were a disappointment."

In recognition of the importance of careful planning for the Institute, the entire staff met for two days during April at Central Washington State College for a pre-Institute planning conference. Staff members were given an opportunity to get acquainted, to get oriented to the campus, and to discuss Institute philosophy and details. A tentative lecture schedule was established, including staff assignments, staff members were given their main committee assignment, and a final selection of textbooks was made.

The entire staff feels that it would have been difficult to conduct this Institute without having had the spring planning conference. The only suggested change was that it should have lasted three days rather than two. The additional day would have made it possible to discuss participants in greater detail, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the first contacts between staff and participants.

The Institute program was topic-oriented rather than class-oriented. Credit was given as a block, and no individual course titles were listed. Appendix B gives a schedule of lectures. These lectures served as the main source for information. Each lecture was given during a seventy minute period (including time for questions and answers), usually beginning at 7:50 a. m. A twenty-minute coffee break followed the lecture, then the participants were separated into groups of ten, with a staff member for each group, to discuss the lecture.

As indicated above, participants gave staff lectures the weakest rating of any item related to the program, though the rating (3.3) is well above the "fair" level. There are several reasons for the lack of complete success in that area. With only four or five formal lectures to prepare, staff members were somewhat apprehensive at the beginning and the participants were far more critical than they would be of normal class lectures. There was sometimes an improper balance between the time spent on the prepared lecture and in open discussion with participants and other staff members. At times, digressions became too lengthy. There was a tendency to depend more upon published "authorities" than upon their own excellent ideas. Finally, staff members involved in preparing teaching materials for publication

sometimes allowed a commercial or defensive note to be manifested. The most serious error was a continuation of the critical discussions among staff members that characterized staff meetings. During staff meetings, such discussions resulted in some of the best Institute features. They were encouraged during general sessions to stimulate thought and participation by participants. They resulted in stifling participation and intimidating the lecturer, thereby detracting from his effectiveness. As these flaws in the Institute planning were corrected, lectures showed a marked improvement. The consistent hard work and good will of the staff led to this improvement.

Additional improvement could be expected another year, but it must be recognized that the staff lecturer has a difficult assignment. If he makes the continuous contribution that he should during formal and informal discussions with participants, he inevitably discusses topics later included in his lectures, thereby lessening the originality they would otherwise have.

Visiting lecturers were rated somewhat more highly, and certainly contributed to the success of the Institute. Item 40 of the evaluation questionnaire indicates the degree of participant support for visiting lecturers, with only one participant feeling there were too many, 43 feeling the number was appropriate, and six feeling that there were too few. The staff concurred in the general support for the visiting lecturer feature, partly because of the contribution of the lecturer during his visit and partly because of the values derived from the committee work related to each lecturer.

Five lecturers spent two days each at the Institute, each presenting three formal lectures. The lecture-discussion format was the same as for staff lectures, except that participants acted as small group discussion leaders and the lecturer visited two or three discussion groups during each discussion period. Two lectures were presented on the first day and one on the second. During the second afternoon, the lecturer participated in a panel discussion or a general question/answer period as a review of his topic. All formal lectures and the final session were recorded and made available to interested participants. During the two days a visiting lecturer was at the Institute, his topic was the only subject treated. This concentration was a unique feature of the Institute which was highly desirable. Demands on the lecturer were great, but so was his impact on the participants.

Before the Institute started, participants were sent a list of lecturers and topic titles. They were asked to rank the lecturers in terms of personal interest. From these ratings, a committee of ten participants was named for each lecturer.

One staff member was appointed to work with each of these committees. Each committee was responsible for 1) doing extensive reading on the subject treated, 2) assigning limited reading assignments for all other participants, 3) acting as small-group discussion leaders and recorders during the lecturer's visit, 4) meeting with the lecturer during the first evening to inform him of questions that still needed answering, 5) preparing follow-up oral and written reports to the Institute. In addition to the great increase in benefits derived from the lecturers as a result of these special committees, the committees provided a feeling of continuity for participants.

The effectiveness of an institute such as this one is dependent upon the degree of communication developed between and among staff members and participants. The special lecturer groups met together for all discussion periods during the first week. Thus their staff adviser had an opportunity to begin making their acquaintance immediately. During each of the following weeks, discussion groups were scrambled in order to increase contacts among participants and to give participants an opportunity to work with other staff members. Each participant was thus able to spend at least one week in a discussion group led by each staff member.

The organization of the discussion groups was one of the Institute's strongest features. They provided one of the greatest challenges to staff members and participants who acted as discussion leaders. Participants had to be allowed to contribute whatever they felt was relevant, but they had to be limited in order to encourage participation by all. There had to be an atmosphere of free discussion, but at the same time adequate guidance to keep the discussion related to the subject. Finally, the discussion leader had to fight the temptation to act as a lecturer and provide answers to questions that were raised. The same answers could usually be drawn from participants through discussion, and when this was done there was much greater satisfaction for all. As Institute director, I relieved the staff members during discussion periods following their lectures and during the visit of the lecturer for whom they were responsible. Not only did this increase communication between the director and participants, but it facilitated continual assessment of the effectiveness of Institute activities.

As indicated on the evaluation questionnaire (item 13), the personal projects developed by participants with the aid of staff advisers was one of the stronger Institute features. Appendix F gives the titles of the personal projects and indicates the great variety of topics covered. The personal project was to provide each participant with an opportunity to develop material during the Institute that would apply directly to the foreign language program for which he is responsible. The best projects acted as a means of synthesizing all Institute activities.

Each staff member acted as a personal adviser for the participants in his lecturer committee. During the first week, a twenty-minute conference was scheduled between staff members and each of their advisees. Following that time, participants were encouraged to see their advisers, or other staff members, as they needed help. The rating given the value of individualized attention thus provided (item 10) indicates room for improvement. At a future institute, counseling sessions would be formally scheduled and the periods spent in general professional talk if no help seemed to be needed with the project.

Another unique Institute feature was the assignment of topic committees. There were ten committees with from four to six participants on each. These committees worked independently of the Institute staff. They selected their own chairmen, studied their subjects independently as groups, and prepared written and oral reports. The written reports, in their final forms, were duplicated and distributed to all participants, as were the reports of the lecturer committees. Topic committee titles were 1) Goals of FL instruction, 2) FL curriculum development, 3) FLES, evaluative criteria, 4) FL at the junior high school level, 5) Teaching FL levels four and five, 6) FL lesson plans, 7) Cross-disciplinary instruction, 8) FL teacher evaluation, 9) Defining the roles of supervisors and FL department chairmen, and 10) Public relations.

The topic committees gave participants opportunities to develop and demonstrate leadership abilities. Their reports will provide all participants with some of the most practical and valuable information they took from the Institute.

To summarize the main activities of the participants, each was responsible for attending all lectures and the small group discussions which followed, each acted as a member of the lecturer committee led by a staff member, each was a member of a topic committee, and each was responsible for the development of a personal project. It was hoped that each would also participate in one special project related to areas of individual competence or experience, and consequently not requiring the preparation time of other committee topics. Many of the participants were involved in such special projects, but there was not time to fully develop this program. Reports were given on 1) the work of an FL articulation committee in Michigan, 2) the mandated FLES program in California, 3) the teaching of Latin, 4) the use of audio-visual aids (a series of most successful workshops conducted by three participants) 5) a demonstration of William Bull's "Visual Grammar" for teaching Spanish, and several others. The success of these projects and the general need for more time during the Institute led the staff to recommend the elimination of visits by publishing company consultants during another institute. Presentations would be made by participants experienced with the materials. Participants

would gain this additional experience of reporting to the group and the inevitable note of commercialism from consultants would be avoided.

As an exercise in professional work and in an attempt to give added synthesis to Institute activities, the final week was devoted mainly to a formulation of recommendations that would represent a consensus of Institute staff and participants. The results are found in appendices G, H, and I. There was no activity during the Institute that inspired so much hard thinking and discussion. The general feeling was that time should have been provided periodically for such considerations, perhaps beginning with the third or fourth week.

The most frequent pleas from participants was for more study time. An attempt was made to avoid scheduling any general sessions between 10:10 and 2:30 or 3:00. Participants appreciated having study time while they were fresh and used it well. However, they felt they needed more. Several Wednesday mornings were set aside for personal study, and that helped, but committee meetings were always going on during study periods. Evenings were reserved for optional programs: special reports, workshops, film previews. However these programs were generally so successful that participants wanted to take part. In the final analysis it is likely that adequate time simply cannot be provided during an institute for the study and reading participants want to do.

The materials center was a source of pleasure and frustration to participants. Money provided by the Institute budget was generously supplemented by a special $1,000 library grant from the college, and a fine selection of books and shorter publications was purchased. Publishing companies donated hundreds of dollars worth of materials for exhibits. The USOE provided many pertinent publications. In addition to the required textbooks, a great many publications which were available in sufficient quantity were checked out to participants for individual use during the Institute. The total was a little overwhelming, but it resulted in a general acquaintance with many important publications and a desire to pursue a more serious reading program in the future.

Participants indicated a general approval of the informal Institute program (item 18). The Institute opened with a banquet on Sunday evening, June 19. There was a closing banquet on August 11 with a special participant-prepared program following. The dining hall provided food for an outdoor dinner in the local park at the end of the second week, for a barbecue dinner in the mountains during the sixth week, and another barbecue at the home of the director during the final week. The athletic department provided equipment for games at each of the outings. A special feature of the trip to the mountains was a visit to a dude ranch.

Informal activities added to the effectiveness of the Institute. They should have been better spaced. An attempt was made to charter buses for week-end excursions to some of Washington's scenic spots, but so many participants had brought their cars that they were all quite independent.

The program was essentially very successful. The uniqueness of its format made mistakes inevitable. Small changes would result in improvements; few major changes would be recommended. These changes are summarized in Part III of this report.

ADMINISTRATION: Sections F and G of the evaluation questionnaire deal with aspects of the Institute directly related to administration. There are thirteen items requiring a 5 to 0 rating. The range of the tabulated ratings was from 2.6 to 5.0. Ten of the ratings were 4.2 or better; two were between 3.0 and 4.0; one was under 3.0. Strongest ratings were given the handling of administrative details, the adequacy of secretarial help in terms of attitude, and Institute food. Weakest ratings were given the AV room, the adequacy of secretarial help in terms of number, and the lecture room. The average for the thirteen items was 4.2.

The following random comments indicate some strengths and weaknesses of the Institute administration.

"I, as many of the participants, was often frustrated by the way things were going, but the administration was fluid and made necessary changes in time to avoid crises."
"The Institute was the best organized and administered of the three I have attended."
"I didn't imagine living accommodations would be so good - excellent!"
"This is an excellent place for such an Institute."
"Rooms should be more thoroughly cleaned each week."
"We needed more secretarial help, typewriters for participants, a ditto machine that worked well, and a zerox or thermofax."
"There should be an avoidance of any question concerning grades with an Institute such as this."
"It would have been better if some activities had taken place in other buildings."
"Dining room was too hot. Better ventilation would have been possible, and most helpful."

The weakest rating was given the AV room. Many films were available for previewing. Although an auditorium in another building was available for special presentations requiring the use of films, the main lounge of Anderson Hall was used for films sent by publishing companies. Windows line two sides of the lounge and the drapes cannot adequately darken it, even during early evening hours.

The main lounge was also used for a lecture room. It was really excellent for that purpose. The only criticism was

caused by the chairs which did not have arms for writing. Desks might be requested another year, though the problem was not a very serious one.

The most serious administrative error was the estimation of the amount of secretarial help needed. As indicated in the discussion of the program, there was a lot of planning and correspondence required before the Institute and a lot of materials to be typed, duplicated, stapled, and distributed during the Institute. Without the great amount of help received from participants and staff members, it would have been literally impossible to accomplish the wprk completed at this Institute. In addition to the regular Institute secretary, there should have been two full-time typists and the equivalent of a half-time person to help with audio-visual equipment, tape dubbing, transparency preparations, etc.

The Institute secretary is of great importance to an Institute's success. She inevitably becomes somewhat of an administrative assistant, representing the director in daily contacts with participants and staff. The maturity required to work under continual pressure without becoming irritable is at least as important as the skills a good secretary possesses. Finding such a person is made difficult by virtue of the several months of part-time work preceding the Institute and by the low salary which is offered locally. In the interest of continuing success with NDEA institutes, it is highly desirable that a way be found to offer a salary that can attract well-qualified secretaries. As indicated by participant comments and rating, our Institute secretary was very good. Another year, she would be even better. Her value should be reflected in her salary.

Adequate pay for the Institute secretary was one of the most difficult problems that involved NDEA institute directors and the college administration. Local policies are a limiting factor in this instance, and changes may be necessary.

In general, the college administration was enthusiastic and cooperative. Dr. Charles McCann, Dean of Faculty, was always ready to listen, then to take whatever action seemed appropriate. The experiences gained from this year's institutes will surely facilitate the solution of administrative problems in the future.

Administrative assistance from the USOE started in June, 1965, with a discussion of the idea for the proposal with Dr. James Spillane. After the proposal was approved, my main contact was with Miss Esther Eaton. Her patience and willingness to help were invaluable. The many publications sent from the USOE for distribution to participants on either a permanent or a loan basis were most helpful.

The amount of work related to the directing of an institute is such that an earlier beginning date will be most helpful. Although it is difficult to plan an institute in detail and submit a proposal fourteen months or more before the institute is to be held, an early notification date should make all aspects of an institute easier to plan.

Getting publicity to potential applicants can be difficult, especially when notification of approval is so close to Christmas. Last year, form letters (see appendix H) were prepared and sent out in early December; addresses provided by the USOE were used to achieve a wider circulation after the Institute brochure was printed in January; an ad was run in the Modern Language Journal; and articles were written for publication in the Modern Language Journal and the publication of the Washington Chapter of the AATF. A special effort was made to enlist the aid of FLEditors, state FL supervisors, and school administrators. The effectiveness of the publicity is indicated by the large number of fully qualified applicants.

The selective criteria served as an effective guide in the selection of participants. Although the local college professors who served on the Selection Committee worked most willingly, especially the Chairman of the FL Department, Miss Odette Golden, a longer period of time for the selection of the participants would increase the effectiveness of this volunteer committee and make their work less demanding.

The short period of time between the end of the school year and the beginning of the Institute (only one week) made it difficult to organize adequately for an immediate orientation of participants. Staff members and participants recommended that a future institute start one week later. With more time to prepare for participants, their arrival could be made smoother by posting signs indicating directions to rooms, by placing participants' names on doors, by checking all details of personal comfort, and by planning no staff meetings on the day of participants' arrival.

The fact that the Institute was quite different from other Institutes which have been held necessitated a great amount of orientation to the program. As it became evident during the opening days of the Institute that participants did not know exactly what was expected of them, additional orientation talks and discussions were planned. Personal conferences with each of the participants during the first week helped a great deal in this orientation. There were two major recommendations concerning program orientation.

1. The director should take more time to give a detailed description of Institute operations during the first day.

2. Staff members should be given forty-five minutes to one hour for the first individual conferences with participants rather than the twenty to thirty minute period used this year.

During the first week of the Institute, a representive group of participants was formed to serve as a liaison between director and other participants. Anderson Hall is divided into groups of rooms. Eight participants were housed in each of these groups, and each group elected a representative. By meeting with these representatives, I was able to interpret policies, identify problems, and work out solutions before crises developed.

By working with the delegates, minor problems could be resolved immediately. For example, many participants enjoyed the freedom of smoking during a lecture. Others were bothered by the smoke. As a compromise, it was decided that smoking would not be allowed during general sessions but would be allowed during small group discussions.

More serious problems were not so easily resolved. Grading was the most serious of these problems. At the end of the third week, participants were evaluated by the staff. A second evaluation followed the sixth week. The results of these evaluations were immediate and negative. According to institution policy, it was necessary to use a letter system of grading (A, B, C, D, and E). With credit to be given as a block, grades automatically fell into one category or another. An examination of participants' records showed a general excellence of academic work during recent years, with averages running well above a B. After many hours of thought and discussion by the staff, we decided to award an A to all participants. There was admittedly a wide range in the quality of work done, but we felt that this work fell in the A range when judged by normal standards. Our preliminary grading reflected an unfair ranking of participants.

Evaluation of all aspects of the Institute went on continually through staff meetings, meetings with delegates, a mid-Institute impromptu written evaluation, and finally with the evaluation questionnaire. The latter was the most objective of the measurements, but it cannot be considered final. Participants are too emotionally involved to be objective at the end of an Institute. Consequently I shall send out a second questionnaire in December to get additional information. The combination of the data from the two evaluations will give a better measure of Institute success.

STAFF: I stated above that the program was the key to the success or failure of the Institute. Naturally the staff was responsible for implementing the Institute program. Staff selection was a great responsibility, second only to the planning of the program.

In the evaluation questionnaire, items 7, 10, 11, 39, and 43 refer directly to the regular Institute staff. Participants were not asked to rate individual staff members, but their comments were often personal. These comments and the ratings of staff activities are discussed above in relation to the program.

The range of the tabulated ratings was from 3.3 to 4.2. The average for the five items was 3.7.

Comments of praise for the staff members referred to their accessibility, to participants' personal affection for them, to the amount of work they did, and to the way all participated in Institute activities.

The three following comments typify the major criticisms.

"Staff members should not champion their own causes or materials."
"Staff members should not argue points with each other in group meetings; they seem impolite."
"Staff did not present enough original ideas in lectures."

All staff members were full-time, and all resided at Anderson Hall with the participants. This housing arrangement resulted in continual pressures on staff members, but they were in unanimous agreement at the end of the Institute that such arrangements were highly desirable. Regular office hours were not kept, although appointments could be made. On the contrary, participants were encouraged to ask for help at any time staff members were in their rooms.

Staff responsibilities made it imperative that all members attend all Institute functions required of participants. For that reason, and in the interest of maintaining the best possible communication with participants, it would seem unwise to have part-time staff.

There were five full-time staff members in addition to the director. This ratio of ten participants to one staff member would be too high if visiting lecturers did not play such a vital role. Approximately forty percent of the formal Institute lectures were presented by visiting lecturers. These lectures not only informed participants, but they served as a series of special program features. The relief provided by visiting lecturers made it possible for regular staff members to devote more time to reading of materials being discussed at the

Institute, to prepare for lectures and committee work, and to confer with participants.

The nature of the Institute made it highly desirable that staff members represent various geographical regions, academic backgrounds, and professional experience. Two were university professors whose major responsibilities are related to teacher training; the other three are city supervisors. Arabic, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish are among the modern foreign languages spoken by staff members. At least two additional Slavic languages are spoken, and most of them have studied Latin. Their professional experiences are extremely varied. Consequently, they brought to the Institute a fine balance of scholarship and practical experience.

The lack of experience with an institute of this kind caused the few difficulties referred to in this report. The staff demonstrated strength by making many adjustments during the summer. Another year, this institute experience would add significantly to staff effectiveness.

Central Washington State College faculty were not included as Institute staff members. Several would be excellent as instructors at a language-oriented institute, but it would be unfair to ask them to work with an institute concerned mainly with administrative and curriculum-development problems.

PARTICIPANTS: The selection of participants was the most time-consuming of the administrative activities preceding the Institute. The group fully justified the care taken in the selection.

Section D of the evaluation questionnaire concerns Institute participants: selection procedure and the overall quality of the group. There are fifteen items in section D requiring a 5 to 0 rating. The range of the tabulated ratings was from 3.7 to 4.8 with only two items falling below 4.0. The average for the fifteen items was 4.3.

The comments under "Program" related to personal growth reflect the value participants placed on their contacts with one another and on the work they did this summer. That all work was not of superior quality is suggested by the comment that "Some of the participants presented poorly-organized reports; they could not communicate effectively." Item 35 is a strong endorsement of the program's level of difficulty, with only one participant feeling it was too difficult, 45 that it was appropriate, and four that it was too easy.

When asked in Item 34 whether they would favor greater homogeneity of academic training and professional experience,

only eight voted yes while thirty-eight voted no and four were indifferent. In fact, some participants felt there should be an even greater variety. As one participant stated, "In spite of added difficulties (in terms of program planning) supervisors with training in German should be included in an Institute of this kind. Russian teachers should also be considered."

Staff members were in agreement that the quality of the participants as a group was very high. They felt that most individual weaknesses reflected a lack of training and experience for administrative work, implying a need for more programs such as the one conducted here this summer. They agreed that supervisors with training in German should be included, though this would mean the replacement of one staff member by one who had specialized in German. It would also necessitate an expansion of materials to include a better selection of German text books, journals, and publications of all kinds relative to German teaching, culture, and linguistics.

The staff was not in complete agreement with participants that the variety of administrative positions held by participants was desirable. (Appendix D provides statistics relative to participants' professional, academic, and geographic distribution.) They felt that an effort should be made to limit participation to applicants with at least two hours a day allowed for administrative work and with a minimum of ten teachers under their supervision. They also felt that there should be a larger number of city or area supervisors and that state supervisors of foreign languages should be eligible. There was no criticism of the distribution of participants by age.

Participants indicated personally and on the evaluation questionnaire that their strongest resolutions were to increase the amount and breadth of reading. Many, perhaps most, had overlooked the values of work being done by psychologists and curriculum specialists. There is every reason to believe that most participants will keep these resolutions, and some will undoubtedly earn advanced degrees in the field of foreign language teaching.

The next most frequent comment indicated plans for strengthening the programs for which they are responsible. In many cases, there will be factors that will render the strongest resolutions impossible to keep, but some strengthening seems inevitable.

The degree of professional interest stimulated by the Institute, and the interest of participants in keeping in contact with each other resulted in their forming an association for foreign language supervisors with membership temporarily limited to alumni of this Institute or others which might be held in the future. A newsletter will be printed by and for the members in order to keep them up-to-date on what is happening across the country in FL programs. Minor research projects may be undertaken when members feel they can all benefit from the results.

Participants were told at the beginning that all Institute work would be open-ended. Individual projects were to serve as an outline for future action with modifications made as necessary. Reading was recognized as introductory in nature. It is hoped that future communication among Institute alumni will result in an extension of the program's influence on foreign language teaching.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Page 22.	Appendix	A:	Directory of staff, lecturers, and participants
Page 28.	Appendix	B:	Schedule of Institute lectures
Page 31.	Appendix	C:	Required textbooks
Page 32.	Appendix	D:	Summary of information on Institute participants
Page 34.	Appendix	E:	End-of-Institute evaluation questionnaire and tabulated results
Page 40.	Appendix	F:	Directory of individual project titles
Page 43.	Appendix	G:	Institute recommendations and professional statements
Page 48.	Appendix	H:	Form letters, publicity
Page 54.	Appendix	I:	Form letters of notification to participants, alternates, and rejects
Page 57.	Appendix	J:	Personal information from participants
Page 61.	Appendix	K:	Statement of acceptance from alternates
Page 63.	Appendix	L:	General information sent to participants

DIRECTORY: Staff

Name and title	Home address	School address
Lester W. McKim Assistant Prof. of Fr.	Rt. 2, Box 86 Ellensburg, Wash.	Dept. of For. Lang. Central Washington State College Ellensburg, Wash.
Carl Dellaccio Director of Foreign Languages	P. O. Box 446 Gig Harbor, Wash.	Tacoma Pub. Schools P. O. Box 1357 Tacoma, Wash.
Frederick Eddy Prof. of French	1510 Bluebell Ave. Boulder, Colo.	Dept. of French Univ. of Colorado Boulder, Colorado
Ann Komadina Foreign Language Consultant	Rte. 3, Box 3004 Albuquerque, N. M.	Albuquerque Pub. Schools Albuquerque, N. M.
Edward Matkovick F. L. Coordinator		Bellevue Pub. Schools 145-160th Place S.E. Bellevue, Wash.
William Merhab Assoc. Prof.	715 S. Forest Ave. Ann Arbor, Mich.	Dept. of F. L. Univ. High School Univ. of Michigan Ann Arbor, Mich.

DIRECTORY: Visiting Lecturers

Dwight Allen Assoc. Prof. of Education	School of Education Stanford Univ. Stanford, Calif.
John B. Carroll Prof. of Educational Psychology	Harvard University Cambridge, Mass.
Elton Hocking Prof. of Modern Language Education	Purdue Univ. Lafayette, Ind.
Howard Lee Nostrand Prof. of Fr.	Dept. of Romance Languages Univ. of Washington Seattle, Wash.
Robert Politzer Prof. of Education and Romance Linguistics	School of Education Stanford Univ. Stanford, Calif.

DIRECTORY: Participants

Adame, Cora FL Dept. Chairman	2021 Emerald Dr. Lawrence, Kansas	Lawrence High School Lawrence, Kan.
Atkins, Jeannette FL Dept. Chairman	156 Pequot Ave. Southport, Conn.	Staples High School 70 North Avenue Westport, Conn.
Barrett, Martin Dept. Chairman	415 Clara Ave. St. Louis, Mo.	McCluer High School 1896 So. Florissant Road Florissant, Mo.
Battin, Yvette FL Dept. Chairman	223 E. 47th St. San Bernardino, Calif.	San Bernardino H. S. San Bernardino, Calif.
Beaulieu, Roderic FL Dept. Head	41 Brunswick Ave. West Hartford, Conn.	Brd. of Administration 7 Whiting Lane West Hartford, Conn.
Biggers, Gladys Fr. Dept. Chairman	1248 12th St. Augusta, Georgia	Laney High School 1339 Gwinnet St. Augusta, Georgia
Blakeley, Rector FL Dept. Chairman	Route 1 Walworth, Wis.	Muskego-Norway Consolidated Schls. Muskego, Wis.
Cerwin, Doris FL Coordinator	1045 Stone St. Rahway, N. J.	South Plainfield H.S. South Plainfield, N.J.
Côté, Norman FL Dept. Chairman	Perkins Road Londonderry, N.H.	North Shore Community College Beverly, Mass.
Couture, Louise FL Coordinator	2251 Welch Walled Lake, Mich.	Birmingham Pub. Schools Birmingham, Mich.
DeGere, Helen Director of FL Programs	58 Walnut St. Needham, Mass.	Needham H. S. 609 Webster St. Needham Heights, Mass.

	A: Pre-institute address	B: Post-institute address
Díaz, Manuel FL Dept. Chairman	1627 Madison St. Wenatchee, Wash.	Wenatchee H. S. Idaho & King St. Wenatchee, Wash.
	No home address	Tulip Tree House, 514 Indiana Univ. Bloomington, Ind.
Di Giam Battista, Ellen FL Dept. Chairman	512 S.E. Delaware Minneapolis, Minn.	Ramsey H. S. 1261 Highway 36 St. Paul, Minn.
Field, Bill City Supervisor	17057 Via Cielo San Lorenzo, Calif.	San Lorenzo Unified Sch. 15510 Usher Street San Lorenzo, Calif.
Fleury, Clarence FL Dept. Chairman	3912 Tahoe Walled Lake, Mich.	Waterford-Kettering High School 2800 Bender St. Drayton Plains, Mich.
Gaffey, Katharine FL Dept. Chairman	7731 Udine Ave. Orlando, Florida	Boone High School 2000 S. Mills St. Orlando, Florida
Gallagher, Gerald City Coordinator	436 Palm Dr. Glendale, Calif.	1440 E. Broadway Glendale H. S. Glendale, Calif.
Garimaldi, Colette City Coordinator	519 Bloomfield Ave. Apt. 6A Caldwell, N. J.	Caldwell H. S. Westville Ave. W. Caldwell, N.J.
Gilbert, Zenobia Dist. Coordinator of FL Instruction	252-15 82nd Ave. Bellerose, N. Y.	Sewanhaka H. S. 500 Tulip Avenue Floral Park, N. Y.
Gonsalves, Dorothy FL Dept. Chairman	2438 Chuckanut Dr. P. O. Box 33 Bellingham, Wash.	Sehome High School 2100 Sehome Dr. Bellingham, Wash.
Grant, Alberta FL Dept. Chairman FL City-wide Chairman	5 East Monroe Ave. Alexandria, Va.	G. Wash. High Sch. 1005 Mt. Vernon Ave. Alexandria, Va.

Hale, Wilford Dist. Supervisor	124 Goodwin Dr. Blackfoot, Idaho	440 West Judicial Blackfoot, Idaho
Hamilton, Robert City Coordinator	1034 Fourth Ave. Kalispell, Mont.	Flathead H. S. Kalispell, Mont.
Howell, Florence FL Supervisor	2202 Rucker Ave. Everett, Wash.	Cascade H. S. 801 Casino Rd. Everett, Wash.
Hunter, Thomas FL Dept. Chairman	1636 N. 51st Seattle, Wash.	Bellevue Sr. H.S. Bellevue, Wash.
Hyland, George FL Area Chairman	4044 South Fawcett Tacoma, Wash.	Lincoln H. S. 37th & "G" Sts. Tacoma, Wash.
Keenan, Patricia FL Head	2682 17th Ave. San Francisco, Calif.	Lincoln H. S. 2162 24th Ave. San Francisco, Calif.
Kennedy, Joseph FL Coordinator	729 St. David's Ave. Warminster, Pa.	Cent. Bucks School District W. Court & Lafayette Sts. Doylestown, Pa.
Lamb, Doyle FL Dept. Chairman	120 Kamala Way Goleta, Calif.	San Marcos H. S. 4750 Hollister Ave. Santa Barbara, Calif.
Lopez, William Supervisor of FL Teaching	229 North Sherwood Street Fort Collins, Colo.	Poudre H. S. 2401 La Porte Ave. Fort Collins, Colo.
McCloud, Catherine FL Dept. Head	P. O. Box 4052 Virginia Beach, Va.	Maury H. Sh. 15th St. & Moran Avenue Norfolk, Va.
Martínez, Daniel FL Curriculum Specialist	805 Berkley Pueblo, Colo.	Pueblo Pub. Schools 102 West Orman Pueblo, Colo.
Micozzi, Arthur FL Dept. Chairman	2401 Lampost Lane Baltimore, Md.	Overlea Sen. H. S. 5401 Kenwood Ave. Baltimore, Md.

Minkin, Rita FL Dept. Chairman	1561 Five Points Rd.SW Albuquerque, N.M.	Albuquerque H.S. 110 Broadway,N.E. Albuquerque, N.M.
Navarrete, Pete FL Dept. Chairman	3535 W. Catalina Dr. Phoenix, Ariz.	3415 N. 59th Ave. Phoenix, Ariz.
Powell, Richard FL Dept. Chairman	301 Maple St. Vestal, N. Y.	Vestal High Sch. Vestal, N. Y.
Root, Inez City Supervisor	Box 482, Rt. 5 Chesapeake, Va.	Chesapeake Pub. Schools Cedar Rd. Chesapeake, Va.
Rosenberg, Morris FL Dept,Chairman	33 Brian Rd. West Caldwell,N.J.	New Milford H. S. River Rd. New Milford, N. J.
Sandstedt, Lynn Coordinator of FL	2736 Meadowbrook Lane Greeley, Colo.	Greeley Cent. H. S. 1515 14th Ave. Greeley, Colo.
Schabacker, Ruth FL Dept. Chairman	147 Summit Ave. Apt. #44 Summit, N. J.	Summit H. S. 129 Kent Place Blvd. Summit, N. J.
Shawcroft, John Dist. FL Supervisor	966 East 10th Ave. Broomfield, Colo.	Boulder Valley Pub. Schools Box 186 Boulder, Colo.
Skoczylos, Rudolph City Supervisor	50 Cedar Court Gilroy, Calif.	Gilroy Unified Sch. 263 N. Church St. Gilroy, Calif.
Steber, Bernard City Supervisor	173-14 Warwick Crescent Jamaica, N. Y.	FL Coordinator Brentwood Pub. Schools Brentwood,N. Y.
Sullivan, Edmund City Supervisor	610 South Runnymede Evansville, Ind.	Bosse H. S. 1300 Wash. Ave. Evansville, Ind.
Sutley, Edgar Area Supervisor	P. O. Box 373 Mt. Dora, Florida	Ad. Building Lake Co. Brd. of Pub. Instruction Tavares, Florida

Tanguay, Edward Dist. FL Supervisor	450 So. Lee St. Denver, Colo.	1580 Yarrow St. Lakewood, Colo.
Taylor, Frances Area Supervisor	4176 Millersville Road Indianapolis, Ind.	Ind. Pub. Schools Instruction Center 1644 Roosevelt Ave. Indianapolis, Ind.
Tempest, Anne FL Dept. Chairman	Box 205 Gresham, Oreg.	Grant High School Portland, Ore.
Wood, Harold FL Dept. Chairman	4219 Rawlins Dallas, Texas	Adamson H. S. 201 E. 9th Dallas, Texas
Zinn, Norman City Supervisor	6516 Binney Omaha, Neb.	Omaha Pub. Schools 3902 Davenport Omaha, Neb.

SCHEDULE OF INSTITUTE LECTURES

The following lectures were given during the Institute by staff members and visiting lecturers and consultants.

Date	Lecturer	Title
June 20	McKim	A. Institute and institution orientation. B. Desirable qualifications for FL supervisors.
June 21	Komadina	A. Interpreting goals to students, teachers, school administrators, and the public. B. Adult FL Education.
June 22	Matkovick	A. Techniques used in curriculum development. B. Procedures for securing, distributing, and using teaching materials.
June 23	Dellaccio	A. Classroom visitation and teacher evaluation. B. Conducting FL departmental meetings C. New concepts for in-service training.
June 24	Dellaccio	Strengthening FL departments: A. What to do about incompetent teachers B. Importance of developing leaders among strong teachers. C. Attracting quality teachers to your school.
June 27	Allen	Curriculum development and flexible class scheduling, lectures 1 and 2.
June 28	Allen	Curriculum development and flexible class scheduling, lecture 3.
June 29	Matkovick	Structure of FLES materials.
June 30	Matkovick	Trends in current FLES materials.
July 1	Dellaccio	Articulation of FL instructional programs: A. Instructional continuity, FLES to college. B. Supervisor's role in developing continuity.

July 6	Merhab	Developing better teacher-training programs: A. Undergraduate college training. B. Continuing education at the graduate level.
July 7	Komadina	In-service training for beginning teachers.
July 8	Politzer	Lecture 1: Linguistics and the preparation of teaching materials. Lecture 2: Linguistics and the training of the language teacher.
July 9	Politzer	Lecture 3: Linguistics and the pupil.
July 11	McKim	Wake up and dream, a look at the FL teaching profession.
July 12	Komadina	Evaluating FL teaching materials.
July 14	Merhab	Evaluating the total FL program.
July 15	Merhab	FL instruction in the total curriculum.
July 18	Nostrand	Lecture 1: The relevant aims of American Education: Why give understanding of a foreign socio-cultural system? The consequent problems of selecting and defining the essentials. Lecture 2: Organizing a synthesis of the essentials to be grasped. Making the essentials assimilable.
July 19	Nostrand	Lecture 3: Vertical and horizontal coordination of the FL sequence in the curriculum to make the socio-cultural component effective.
July 21	Matkovick	The use of TV in FL instruction.
	Dellaccio	FL homework: A demonstration of programmed and individualized instruction as illustrated by Bull's teaching materials.
July 22	Briscoe	Curriculum development and FL instruction, lectures 1 and 2.
July 25	Eddy	The teaching of classical languages.

July 26	Komadina	Achievement grouping and criteria for student placement.
July 27	Eddy	Planning for optimum use of language laboratories.
July 28	Carroll	Lecture 1: Foreign language aptitude testing.
July 29	Carroll	Lecture 2: Foreign language proficiency and achievement testing. Lecture 3: A report of recent research with the MLA FL proficiency tests as applied to a nationwide sample of college seniors majoring in foreign languages.
Aug. 1	Hocking	Use of audio-visual aids in FL teaching, lectures 1 and 2.
Aug. 2	Hocking	Use of audio-visual aids in Fl teaching, lecture 3.
Aug. 3	Komadina	Materials and goals for FL instruction, level 4 and beyond.
Aug. 4	Matkovick	Development of successful FLES programs.
Aug. 5	Merhab	Expanding foreign language offerings.
Aug. 9	Dellaccio	Effective use of native speakers and recordings.
Aug. 12	Eddy	Summary and evaluation of the Institute.

TEXTBOOKS

All participants are to have personal copies of the texts listed below. Costs of textbooks and of materials such as paper, pens, etc. are to be paid by participants. Texts have been ordered and will be available at the college book store or at another local book store. If you already own any of these books, you may wish to bring them and avoid this expenditure.

Allen, Dwight W. & Bush, Robert N., A New Design for High School Education: Assuming a Flexible Schedule. McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Brooks, Nelson H., Language and Language Learning: Theory & Practice. Second Edition, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

Bull, William E., Spanish for Teachers, Applied Linguistics. Ronald Press, 1965.

Finocchiaro, Mary, Teaching Children Foreign Languages. McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Mildenberger, Kenneth, FLES Packet. Modern Language Association, Materials Center.

Modern Language Association, Materials Center, Selected List of Materials and Supplements for French & Spanish.

Politzer, Robert L., Teaching French: An Introduction to Applied Linguistics. Ginn & Co., 1961.

Rivers, Wilga, The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher. University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Valdman, Albert, Trends in Language Teaching. McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Walsh, Donald D., What's What. Modern Language Association, Materials Center.

You may also wish to bring a tape recorder and some blank tapes. These items are not required but may be useful.

We are enclosing a schedule of lectures and a reprint of an article describing the Institute. These will be helpful to you in case you wish to do some advance reading and planning.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

Total number of participants:	50
men:	29
women:	21
Ages of participants	
25 to 35:	8
36 to 45:	24
46 to 55:	14
56 to 65:	4
Number of states represented:	25
Language background	
Major training in French:	16
Major training in Spanish:	25
Nearly equal training in French and Spanish:	9
Some training in both:	20
M.A. degrees in French:	10
M. A. degrees in Spanish:	14
Native speakers of French:	3
Native speakers of Spanish:	7
Previous NDEA foreign language institute experience	
No previous institute:	6
One preious institute:	23
Two or more previous state-side institutes:	19
One overseas institute:	11
Instructor at one or more previous institutes:	6
Administrative position	
High school department chairmen:	23
Area or city supervisors:	27
Responsible for FL program at FLES level only:	1
at FLES and FLHS levels:	14
at FLHS level only (7-12):	35

Number of FL teachers under direction of participants

1 to 5:	6
6 to 10:	16
11 to 15:	8
16 to 20:	2
21 to 30:	6
31 to 50:	3
51 to 100:	7
over 100:	2

Total number of FL teachers under direction of Institute participants: 1649

END-OF-INSTITUTE EVALUATION August, 1966

This form seeks your opinions of some important considerations about our Institute. Its purpose is not to evaluate the Institute so much as it is to gather data. These data will be used to make future institutes more effective. Their usefulness is directly related to your frankness.

PART I: Directions:

1. Note that many items in Part I call for ratings on a scale of 5 to 0. For this scale, use the key listed below. Items which do not use this scale will use a self-explanatory system.

   5 Exceptionally Good
   4 Good
   3 Fair
   2 Poor
   1 Exceptionally Poor
   0 Not relevant to this Institute

2. Following each lettered set of questions, you are asked to write your own comments. Continue on the back of the page if necessary.

3. Please respond to each item.

A. Institute Objectives

1. How realistic and useful were the stated objectives of the Institute in terms of your own interests, experiences, and job functions? 4.7
   (a. The development of a realistic definition of the responsibilities of FL supervisors and department chairmen at the city, county and regional levels.
   b. The strengthening of leadership potential.
   c. The gaining of knowledge of recent trends and developments in FL instruction.
   d. The completion of individual projects applicable to each participant's local responsibilities.
   e. The strengthening of participants' sense of professional pride.)

2. To what degree was the content of the Institute appropriate to its stated objectives? (See above, no. 1.) 4.0

3. Rate the attention given to the following aspects of FL learning:

applied linguistics	4.0
applied psychology	3.4
pedagogy	3.7
curriculum development	4.0

4. Rate the attention given to background information needed in supervisory work. 3.8

5. As a whole, how appropriate was the Institute program for the professional development of foreign language leaders? 4.2

COMMENTS: Feel free to use the back of this page.

B. Institute Program: Content

6. Rate the value of workshops, demonstrations, and special committee reports presented by participants. 4.2

7. Rate the general quality of the staff lectures. 3.3

8. Rate the general quality of the small-group discussions. 3.6

9. Rate the general quality of the presentations made by consultants from publishing companies. 3.4

10. Rate the quality of individualized attention you received from members of the Institute staff. 3.6

11. Rate the experience of working with the "lecturer" committee. 3.7

12. Rate the experience of working with the "topic" committee. 3.9

13. Rate the experience of developing a personal project. 4.4

14. Rate the materials used during the Institute:

a. Textbooks	4.1
b. Materials checked out to participants	4.2
c. Publications in the Materials center	4.2
d. Exhibits from publishing companies	3.7

15. How important are the materials which have been produced and distributed during this Institute?

a. Lecture notes	4.1
b. Committee reports	4.2
c. Bibliographies	4.1

COMMENTS: Use the back of this page.

C. Institute Program: Organization

16. Rate the amount of time allowed for each of the activities listed below using as a scale:

	too much	adequate	too little
a. staff lectures	12	33	1
b. small-group discussions periods	12	33	5
c. individual study time	1	31	18
d. informal exchange of ideas with colleagues	0	32	18

17. Rate the usefulness of the half-day left during most weeks for individual study time. (5 to 0) 4.6

18. During an eight-week Institute of this kind, there should be how many group social mid-week activities (dances, picnics, etc.)?
Circle one: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (4, most; 3, strong.)

19. Rate the number of topics covered by staff and visitors in formal lectures.
Check one: too many 5 appropriate 41 too few 4

20. Should there have been a specific period of time (three or four days) allotted for training in the techniques of leadership, perhaps handled by a visiting specialist in that field - not an FL person.
Check one: yes 48 no 2 indifferent 0

21. If such a special training period were scheduled, it should come during which week of an eight-week Institute?
Circle one: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (1, most; 2, strong.)

22. How long should this Institute be? Circle one:
6 weeks 25 7 weeks 16 8 weeks 9

23. What would be the best beginning and closing dates? (State your preference in each of the three categories.)

six weeks		seven weeks		eight weeks	
June 20 to July 30	8	June 20 to Aug. 5	6	June 20 to Aug. 12	7
June 27 to Aug. 5	15	June 27 to Aug. 12	10	June 27 to Aug. 19	3
July 5 to Aug. 12	1	July 5 to Aug. 19	0		
July 11 to Aug. 19	0				

24. Would you prefer to have the Institute

20 begin on Monday and end on Friday.
9 begin on Wednesday and end on Tuesday.
21 at the convenience of the college; not important to you.

COMMENTS:

D. Institute Participants

25. How appropriate were the criteria used by the director in selecting participants?
Rate 5 to 0.

a. Current position as a department chairman or a foreign language supervisor	4.8
b. Supervisory experience	4.6
c. Teaching experience	4.7
d. Evidence of potential as a leader	4.6

26. Rate the participants' enthusiasm for, and interest in, the content of the Institute. 4.0

27. Rate the general esprit de corps. 4.0

28. Rate the participants' use of their unstructured time. 4.0

29. Rate the participants' work in committees. 4.0

30. Rate your personal growth during this Institute. 4.4

31. Rate the growth of the participants in general. 4.2

32. Rate the value of the wide geographical distribution of the Institute participants. 4.7

33. Rate the value of the variety of adminstrative positions held by Institute participants. 4.5

34. Would greater homogeneity of academic training and professional experience be beneficial to such an institute?
Check one: yes 8 no 38 indifferent 4

35. Institute activities demanded various degrees of experiential and academic backgrounds. In general, these activities were

1 too demanding for you.
44 appropriate for you.
4 too easy for you.

36. To what extent did the exclusion of families benefit the Institute? 4.4
(6 voted "0")

37. To what extent was it beneficial to accept only applicants with major training in either French or Spanish? (Rate 5 to 0) 3.7
(9 voted "0")

38. Rate the desirability of accepting German majors. 3.9

COMMENTS:

E. Institute Staff:

39. To what degree were regular staff members familiar with problems and developments in today's schools? 4.2

40. How appropriate was the number of visiting lecturers? Check one: too many 1 appropriate 43 too few 6

41. Rate the general contribution made by the visiting lecturers and consultants. Rate 5 to 0 4.1

NAME _____

PART II. How, if at all, have this summer's institute experiences strengthened or caused you to change your future plans (graduate work, job goals, further experiences, etc.)? Explain each briefly on this page.

F. Physical Facilities

44. Rate each of the following related to physical facilities:

a.	rooms	4.6
b.	custodial service	4.5
c.	mail service	4.2
d.	dining rooms	4.3
e.	food	4.9
f.	lecture room	3.8
g.	discussion areas	4.2
h.	AV equipment	4.3
i.	AV room	2.6

COMMENTS:

G. Administration of the Institute

45. Rate the handling of administrative details (stipends, materials, etc.). 5.0

46. Rate the adequacy of secretarial and clerical help in terms of attitude. 5.0

47. Rate the adequacy of secretarial and clerical help in terms of number. 3.0

48. Rate the overall administration of the Institute. 4.6

COMMENTS:

NAME_____

PART II. How, if at all, have this summer's institute experiences strengthened or caused you to change your future plans (graduate work, job goals, further experiences, etc.)? Explain each briefly on this page.

DIRECTORY OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECT TITLES

ADAME: In-Service Training for Teachers

ATKINS: The Westport Language Laboratory: Facts, Failures, and Future

BARRETT: An In-Service Training Program to Implement the Revision of the Curriculum of McCluer High School, St. Louis County: the Learner, the Teacher, the Curriculum

BATTIN: Psychological Problems of the Learner in FL tudy

BEAULIEU: A Public Relations Program to Explain the FLES Program to Parents

BIGGERS: Staff Orientation in the Use of the Holt Materials: Ecouter et Parler

BLAKELEY: A Local Educational Radio Station

CERWIN: Improvement of the MFL Program at South Plainfield High School:
A. Plans for Immediate Implementation, 1966-67
B. Proposals requiring longer range study

CÔTÉ: A Sequential French Program for the Beverly School System and the North Shore Community College

COUTURE: Progress Test at FLES Level

DEGERE: Improvement of Articulation in the French Program in the Needham Public Schools

DIÁZ: Foreign Language Instruction Below Grade 9 (grades 7,8)

DI GIAM BATTISTA: The FL Scene in the Roseville Schools

FIELD: The Foreign Language Teacher's Handbook

FLEURY: In-Service Training

GAFFEY: Team Teaching in FL at Wm. R. Boone High School, Orlando, Florida

GALLAGHER: A Projected Plan for a Strong FL Program in Grades 7 and 8 of the Glendale Schools

GARIMALDI: Individualizing Instruction; Improving Supervision

GILBERT; Upgrading Language Instruction though Improved Language Testing

GONSALVES: A Plan for the Use of the Language Laboratory at the Sehome High School in Bellingham, Wash.

GRANT: Articulation of the Alexandria FLES Materials with A-LM, Level One

HALE: Sequential Foreign Language Program, Grades 7-12

HAMILTON: Examination and Treatment of an Ailing FLES Program

HOWELL: Proposed Guidelines for Teaching Foreign Language in the Everett Schools

HUNTER: A Step Toward Flexible Scheduling

HYLAND: A New Organization Pattern: Area Chairmen

KEENAN: Revision and Expansion of SPANISH FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS, Heath (Level I, Part I; Level II, Lessons 1-5)

KENNEDY: In-Service Training in the Central Bucks School District

LAMB: Workshop Materials for Defining Overall FL Objectives and the Specific Objectives of 3rd, 4th, and 5th year Spanish in SBHS District

LOPEZ: Guidelines for an In-Service Training Program for the FL Department of the Poudre R-1 Schools

MCCLOUD: A Proposed Plan for an FL Program in the Public Schools in Norfolk, Virginia

MARTÍNEZ: An approach to the teaching of cross-cultural understanding in cooperation with the Supplementary Educational Center of the Pueblo Public Schools of Colorado through the teaching of the English and Spanish languages as communication in the school and community.

MICOZZI: Coordination of FL Department Activities through Structured Department Meetings (wide implications) to be submitted to FL Supervisor and Principal

MINKIN: The Role of the Foreign Language Department in the High School Curriculum in Albuquerque High School

NAVARRETE: Spanish in Grades 7 and 8

POWELL: FLES for Vestal

ROOT: Evaluation of the Aural-Oral Aspect of the Foreign Language Program in the Chesapeake High Schools

ROSENBERG: Workbook to Accompany A-LM Spanish: Level One (in collaboration with Bernard Steber)

SANDSTEDT:
1. An Exemplary Program in the Effective Use of the Secondary School Language Lab and Electronic Classroom: Student-Teacher Operation Supplementing their College Methods Course (a possible sub-division: compared effectiveness of Language Lab and Electronic Classroom)
2. Micro-teaching via CCTV for Greeley, Colorado; In-Service Training and Colorado State College MFL Methods Course

SCHABACKER: The 5th Level French after ALM: Review Grammar, Civilization, Literature

SHAWCROFT: A Project to Prepare Visual Materials to Aid in Interpreting the FL Program to School Patrons and Professional Staff

SKOCZYLAS: Correlating the FL Film with the Instructional Program: Planned Activity or Guessing Game?

STEBER: Workbook to Acoompany A-LM Spanish: Level One (in collaboration with Morris Rosenberg)

SULLIVAN: Blueprint for FL Sequence (grades 7-8) for Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation

SUTLEY: The scheduling of Spanish in the Junior High Schools of Lake County, Florida: An Exercise in Cooperative, Progressive Change

TANGUAY: Foreign Language Program Visugraphs

TAYLOR: Unit Tests for "Entender y Hablar"

TEMPEST: Flexible Scheduling for Grant High School

WOOD: An Aid to Lesson-Plan Making: Grouping Class and Lab Materials that Fit Together (based on ENTENDER Y HABLAR)

ZINN: A Language Laboratory Program to Build Competence in Standard English among Sub-standard Speakers

After several weeks of individual and group study and discussion, an attempt was made to develop a set of recommendations relative to FL study which would represent a strong consensus of the Institute staff and participants. These efforts resulted in the recommendations and the resolution listed below. Each recommendation received considerable attention; the list is limited to those that truly represent the conviction of the Institute group.

1. JOB DESCRIPTION: Foreign language supervisors or department chairmen should have a written job description developed at the local level. This job description should be approved by the local school authorities and be incorporated into the official policies and procedures of the Board of Education.

2. POLICIES AND BUDGETS: Foreign language supervisors or department chairmen should assist in FL policy making and in establishing FL program budgets. Once policies and budgets have been approved, they should have the authority to implement the policies and approve the expenditures.

3. FL TEACHER EMPLOYMENT: Foreign language supervisors or department chairmen should have a voice in the employing of FL teachers. Though such authority may vary among districts, it should include at least the right to make recommendations on the basis of an evaluation of language competence and teacher potential.

4. LANGUAGE LABORATORIES:

   a. Foreign language supervisors or department chairmen should assume responsibility for developing and attaining educational specifications for all FL electronic installations and for assistance in solving the technical problems related to acoustics, location, and physical specifications.

   b. The audio-visual department should maintain the equipment of the installations, should expedite the purchase and delivery of AV equipment and materials, and should channel information of current AV interest to the FL departments in the schools.

   c. An electronic installation should be so designed that it provides for expansion and use of improved equipment and materials now being developed.

5. PUBLISHING: In recognition of the profession's need for articles written by public school teachers, we recommend that FL supervisors publish articles and appraisals of teaching materials and encourage FL teachers to do likewise.

6. EXPERIENCED-TEACHER SCHOLARSHIPS: We strongly recommend to the U. S. Office of Education, and to foundations interested in promoting FL study, that they increase the number of scholarships for experienced FL teachers. These scholarships should be given to strengthen FL competency, to provide for professional growth, and to further cultural insights.

7. FL TEACHER CERTIFICATION: We recommend that the scores of the MLA tests, or similar tests, be a part of the FL teacher's record of certification, and that these scores be used by local districts as a part of the process of screening applicants for teaching positions.

8. FLES: We recommend that school districts delay the establishment of FLES programs until a six-year articulated program has been developed in the secondary schools.

9. LATIN IN PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULUM: Foreign language supervisors and department chairmen owe a measure of responsibility to the teachers of classical languages, particularly Latin, in their districts. We urge them to:

   a. recognize the classical language teachers' concern over decreasing enrollments in their classes,

   b. keep themselves in frequent and regular touch with new developments in the field,

   c. help classical language teachers define their objectives clearly,

   d. help them keep informed about new trends in Latin teaching materials and techniques,

   e. help them maintain the proper place of Latin in the total curriculum,

   f. supply information about the values of the classics in American education to anyone interested, including modern foreign language teachers, students, administrators, counselors, and parents.

   g. in short, do an honest job of encouraging the effective teaching and learning of the classical languages.

(To help in this endeavor there is an information center in the National Office of the American Classical League opening formally on 1 September 1966. Address:

Dr. John F. Latimer, Executive Secretary
American Classical League
George Washington University
Washington, D. C. 20006

PUBLISHING COMPANY RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. FL BOOK SERIES: We recommend that publishers

(1) produce materials specifically designed to cover a long FL sequence beginning with FLES and continuing through the secondary program,

(2) vary the format to create and maintain interest throughout the sequence and

(3) provide guidelines for proper evaluation at each level.

b. TAPE AND DISC RECORDINGS: We recommend that tape and disc recordings meet the specifications listed on pages 147 to 149 of the MLA Selective List of Materials, edited by Mary J. Ollman, 1962.

c. FL CONSULTANTS: We recommend that publishing companies, upon request, make adequate consultant services available for FL teacher workshops.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING BILINGUALISM: Whereas we recognize that bilingualism is a definite national asset,

and whereas there are over three million school age individuals in the continental United States who possess the linguistic and cultural attributes associated with bilingualism,

and whereas many schools are failing to exploit this national resource.

Therefore be it resolved that wherever concentrations of bilinguals are found the school philosophy be committed to provide for the development of appropriate bilingual programs.

Letter to Mr. John H. Fisher, Executive Secretary, MLA, favoring William Riley Parker's proposal for a national foreign language association.

During the final days of the NDEA Foreign language Leadership Institute at Central Washington State College, quite a bit of time is being devoted to a discussion of professional organizations which are especially important to FL teachers and supervisors. As part of our study, all participants have been given a copy of Dr. William Riley Parker's address delivered 29 April 1966 at the Nineteenth University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference. This letter is an expression of the feelings of a majority of the Institute staff members and participants concerning Dr. Parker's "Afterthoughts on a Profession."

We, too, are perplexed by the proliferation of professional groups. We approve of the proposal concerning a national foreign language association. We feel:

1. that there has been a general improvement in working relations among the various FL professional groups during recent years which indicates that now is the time to seek greater national unity;

2. that there are "young, energetic, imaginative" scholars fully qualified to direct such an organization;

3. that the proposed national organization should:

   a. be a service organization to act as a national clearing house and a coordinating center.

   b. provide a parent organization for affiliated groups. These might include, for example, the National Association of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages, the fledgling Language Laboratory Directors' Association, and similar organizations that might be formed in the future.

   c. ultimately establish regional offices which would serve as collecting agencies for membership dues for affiliated organizations and as clearing houses providing information useful in planning local, state, or regional conferences.

   d. assess each member a general fee entitling him to

      (1) the publication of the parent organization (hopefully the MLJ),
      (2) the publication of one AAT, and
      (3) a monthly or quarterly descriptive publication of abstracts of pertinent articles available as reprints.

e. establish an additional fee entitling members to publications of other constituent groups in which they are interested.

4. that the NEA Department of Foreign Languages should become a vital part of the national foreign language association proposed by Dr. Parker.

Report of the special Institute committee formed to give final consideration to William Riley Parker's proposal for a national foreign language association. Although this report was not accepted by the Institute participants as a whole, it constitutes a fairly strong minority report.

The committee is agreed on three basic points:

1. There is no strong, national, unified, comprehensive FL organization.

2. There is a lack of agreement as to the need for such an organization.

3. This committee is not in a position to determine its desirability.

We do not feel we have sufficient data to consider fully this important question even though Mr. McKim made available to us some pertinent personal correspondence. We do not have the time to gather and consider additional information. The information which we have leaves us with some serious doubts:

1. We do not know whether enough teachers feel the need for such an organization to give any assurance of success.

2. We do not know whether personal and political rivalries which have existed among organizations and individuals have been overcome sufficiently to permit a strong national organization. In light of the information we do have, it is quite apparent that even those most closely involved cannot reach agreement concerning this question.

Due to our need for more information and to our doubts, we strongly recommend that the letter supporting Dr. Parker's proposal not be sent. We feel that serious consideration of that proposal is premature at this time. Strong support at this time could be reckless, it might be dangerous, and it would definitely be unwise.

NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute

December 1, 1965

TO: Foreign Language Supervisors

FROM: Lester W. McKim, Institute Director

SUBJECT: NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute
Central Washington State College
June 20 to August 12, 1966

For the first time in the history of the National Defense Education Act, the U. S. Office of Education has approved a special institute for foreign language supervisors and departmental chairmen. Brochures will be prepared and distributed to you by January. Please feel free to request additional information now or after receiving the brochures. Write Lester McKim, NDEA Foreign Language Institute, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg.

The Institute staff represents many years of foreign language teaching and supervisory experience at several academic levels and in several geographical areas. Their work will be complemented by a series of lectures from six outstanding authorities in specialized fields related to foreign language teaching and supervision.

The lectures by members of the Institute staff and the visiting consultants will provide stimulating insights into the fields of foreign language teaching and supervision. Two materials centers will give participants access to pertinent publications and teaching materials. However, the emphasis throughout the Institute will be on large and small group discussions, individual and group projects, and other activities designed to stimulate professional growth. The teaching staff's major responsibility will be to provide guidance which will insure that every participant leaves the Institute with a completed project designed to strengthen his effectiveness as an administrator, and consequently, to strengthen the foreign language programs for which he is responsible.

The following criteria will be considered when participants are chosen:

1. Participants may come from any part of the United States.

2. Participants must be currently employed as foreign language department chairmen with at least one hour of released time for administrative duties, or as supervisors at the city, county, or regional levels.

3. Participants must have strong competency in either French or Spanish.

4. Professional experience must include at least five years of teaching experience and one year as a foreign language administrator.

5. Previous institute experience will <u>not</u> be a limiting factor.

LM/ks

NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute

January 19, 1966

TO: Foreign Language Supervisors

FROM: Lester W. McKim, Institute Director

SUBJECT: NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute
Central Washington State College
June 20 to August 12, 1966

I am enclosing brochures describing the Special Institute which I shall direct next summer. I hope you will consider this Institute to be of special relevance to foreign language supervisors with major administrative responsibilities. Personally, I think of it more as an eight-week symposium rather than as an Institute.

The design of the Institute is such that staff and participants will be working together cooperatively. The staff will attempt to provide stimuli for thought, discussion, and projects. It will be up to the participants, in cooperation with Institute staff, to arrive at some answers.

I am sending brochures to your superintendent urging him to pass them along to his strongest foreign language supervisory personnel. Realizing that many supervisors are not free during the summer, I am urging administrators to release supervisors who may wish to participate in this Institute.

I shall look forward to hearing from you or from another qualified candidate.

NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute

January 19, 1966

TO: State Foreign Language Supervisors

FROM: Lester W. McKim, Institute Director

SUBJECT: NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute
Central Washington State College
June 20 to August 12, 1966

I am enclosing brochures describing the Special Institute which I shall direct next summer. I hope the Institute will have a special value for State Supervisors. You are in a position to help assure that it will. I should like to make some special requests.

1. Please pass the brochures along to your strongest supervisory personnel and urge them to apply. This Institute is designed to strengthen supervisors who are already effective, not to offer remedial help to those who may be incompetent.

2. Where necessary, urge administrators to release supervisory personnel who are on eleven month contracts so that they may attend.

3. Please send to me a copy of any state or city foreign language curriculum guide or other publication which you feel should be available for examination by participants. Such material will contribute immeasurably to the success of the Institute.

4. Please send a list of supervisors or department chairmen you feel would be most likely to benefit personally and contribute professionally as a result of the Institute experience. This list should be limited in length. It will be considered as a personal recommendation from your office. I shall send a special letter to each person recommended.

I hope it will be possible for you to participate in the Institute at Indiana University. I have been and shall continue to be in contact with George Smith. We feel there are many ways in which our Institutes can complement each other.

My sincere thanks for your cooperation.

NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute

January 19, 1966

TO: School Administrators

FROM: Lester W. McKim, Institute Director

SUBJECT: NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute
Central Washington State College
June 20 to August 12, 1966

I am enclosing brochures describing a special Foreign Language Institute which I shall direct next summer. I should like to request your help.

1. Please pass the brochures along to your strongest foreign language supervisory personnel. This Institute is designed to strengthen supervisors who are already effective, thereby resulting in major contributions to the entire profession as well as to the individual participants and the school systems they represent.

2. Encourage your strongest foreign language supervisory personnel to apply. They may think of NDEA Institutes as being remedial in nature. This one will not be.

3. Make it possible for your strongest foreign language supervisory personnel to attend. Supervisory personnel often work eleven months. Such people will need to be given released time.

Thank you for your cooperation.

NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute

You should be pleased to learn that your State Foreign Language Supervisor has suggested that I forward a brochure to you announcing the NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute which will be held at Central Washington State College next summer. This indication of confidence from your State Department of Education constitutes a strong recommendation.

You can imagine that competition is keen and there is no guarantee that you would be selected. However, I should welcome your application if you have not yet submitted one.

Please accept my compliments for the good work you are doing.

Sincerely,

Lester W. McKim
Institute Director

LWM:mdc

Enclosure

INFORMATION FOR NEWS RELEASE FOR NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTE IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Name Mr. / Miss / Mrs. _____
last first middle

Name and address of hometown newspaper or paper who should get this release.

_____

_____

Husband's
Wife's name _____

Home address _____

Children's
names and ages _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

NDEA Foreign Language Institute

Dear

We are pleased to inform you that you have been selected to participate in the NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute from June 20 through August 12. If you plan to accept appointment as a participant in this Institute, the following items must be received by the institute director in an envelope postmarked no later than midnight, April 23:

1. The acceptance form.
2. The enclosed blue Oath or Affirmation form, duly notarized, and showing the expiration date of the commission of the Notary.
3. The eligibility form, signed by one of your administrative officers. (In some cases, there will have been changes of employment plans since the writing of the applications. Consequently, we are asking for this reassurance.)

Unless the above instructions are followed precisely, automatically your name will be dropped on the morning of April 26, 1966, and a replacement will be made from the waiting list of alternate candidates.

We wish to congratulate you on having been selected. There were more than 200 completed applications, and most of the candidates were fully qualified. It goes without saying that competition was keen and choices difficult.

The Institute staff is working hard to prepare an excellent program. We shall be sending you some pertinent information about May 1.

Sincerely,

Lester W. McKim
Institute Director

LWM:mdc
Enclosures

NDEA Foreign Language Institute

Dear

You have been chosen as an alternate for the NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute to be held on our campus from June 20 to August 12. If an opening permits us to invite you as an applicant, we shall let you know at the earliest possible moment.

If you wish to be considered as an alternate, you must sign and return the enclosed acceptance form in a letter postmarked no later than midnight, April 23. If we have not heard from you by April 26, we shall drop your name from our list of alternates.

We regret that we are not able to give you more favorable consideration at this time. We received more than 200 completed applications, and most of the candidates were fully qualified. It goes without saying that competition was keen and choices difficult. Due to the nature of the Institute, we gave special consideration to geographical distribution, current and potential administrative position, language background, and general professional experience. The alternates are a select group, any one of whom would be an excellent candidate for this Institute. We wish we could accommodate more of you.

Thank you for your interest in our Institute. I hope we may yet be able to ask you to join us.

Sincerely,

Lester W. McKim
Institute Director

LWM:mdc
Enclosure

NDEA Foreign Language Institute

Dear

We regret to inform you that we have been unable to include you among the participants in our NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute. The reasons for not being able to pass favorably upon certain applications are so numerous and complex that it is obviously impossible for me to explain in detail to each of you why you were unsuccessful. However, here are some of the things that entered into our decision.

1. Geographical distribution. Since this is the only Institute of its kind this year, we felt obligated to choose representatives from as many states as possible.
2. Language background. Among considerations were a balance of candidates with French or Spanish competencies, additional language competencies, training in linguistics, and experiences related to school language programs.
3. Current and potential administrative position. We wish not only to profit from the varied experiences of the participants, but to work through them to reach as many foreign language teachers as possible.
4. General professional experience. We have considered professional activity beyond the level required by contractual agreement to be a strong indication of leadership ability.
5. The general tone of the application. We feel that the ability to write a strong application is a further indication of leadership ability.

That you have not been selected is not an indication that you were not qualified. Many excellent candidates simply could not be accommodated. There were only fifty positions to be filled from more than 200 applicants. We thank you for submitting an application, and we hope you will apply for future institutes of this kind.

Sincerely,

Lester W. McKim
Institute Director

LWM:mdc

STATEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE: PARTICIPANT

TO: Mr. Lester W. McKim
NDEA Foreign Language Institute
Central Washington State College (HES)
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

☐ I accept the appointment as a participant in the NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute to be held at Central Washington State College from June 20 to August 12, 1966. I understand that I am not to be accompanied by any dependents. Please reserve one half of a suite in the dormitory for me at $185 for room and board for the eight weeks.

☐ I do not accept the appointment as participant in the NDEA Foreign Language Institute.

Comments:

Date_____ Signed_____

Soc. Sec. No._____

Home
Address_____

STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY

TO: Mr. Lester W. McKim
NDEA Foreign Language Institute
Central Washington State College (HES)
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

This is to certify that_____

has signed a contract to act in the following administrative capacity during the 1966-1967 school year:_____

_____.

In this position, the applicant will teach _____ periods a day and will have _____ periods a day to devote to his administrative duties. (In order to participate in this Institute, the applicant must be given at least one peiod a day, in addition to the regular preparation period, for administrative duties.)

Signed_____

Title_____

School_____

The following information is available on some applications; on others it is not. The individual conferences will be more meaningful if you will answer the following questions. Use round numbers when you approximate the total.

1. What is the total enrollment of the school(s) for which you are responsible?_____

2. How many schools have foreign language programs under your direction?_____
   a. High schools_____
   b. Junior high schools _____
   c. Elementary schools _____

3. A. How many foreign language teachers will work under your direction next year?_____
   B. How many levels of each language?

	A	B
a. French	_____	_____
b. German	_____	_____
c. Latin	_____	_____
d. Russian	_____	_____
e. English as a foreign language	_____	_____
f. other	_____	_____

4. What are the basic texts which will be used for the beginning classes? (You may use abbreviated titles, ie., ALM, Entender y Hablar, Voix et Images, etc.)
   French
   German
   Spanish
   Russian

5. Do you have an idea concerning a project you would like to undertake this summer? It should be fairly broad and relate directly to your administrative responsibilities.

_____

_____

The following information will assist us in assigning you to a suite. As you know, there will be two participants in each suite.

1. I prefer to room with a participant whose major training is in French ( ), Spanish ( ), Either one ( ).

2. I prefer to room with a participant of approximately what age? _____

3. It bothers me to be with a person who smokes.
   (circle one) YES NO
   _____ I smoke.
   _____ I do not smoke.

Other preferences
_____

5. For the benefit of the Director and staff, please send a small photo.

NAME:_____

NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

Visiting Lecturers: Committee Assignments.

(Please return immediately.)

As you have noticed, there will be five lecturers who will visit the Institute, two days each. In order to make the best possible use of these experts, one staff member has been assigned to help Institute participants prepare for each lecturer. This staff member will be aided by ten participants.

The participants involved in the committee work will have responsibilities for more extensive reading and study before the lecturer's arrival, and for leading discussions and acting as recorders during his visit. I hope it is possible for each participant to be assigned to a lecturer who is of special interest to him. We shall do our best to make assignments according to your preferences as indicated below.

Please indicate your preference by writing a number in the parentheses preceding each name. Rank the lecturers <u>one</u> to <u>five</u>, one for first preference. If there are any with whom you would prefer not to work, use the number <u>six</u>.

( ) Dwight Allen, Stanford University, Subject: General curriculum development and flexible scheduling possibilities.

( ) John B. Carroll, Harvard University. Subject: Testing and evaluating foreign language skills.

( ) Elton Hocking, Purdue University, Subject: Use of audiovisual aids in foreign language teaching.

( ) Howard Lee Nostrand, University of Washington. Subject: Developing cross-cultural communication through the foreign language sequence and correlated subjects in the school curriculum.

( ) Robert Politzer, Stanford University. Subject: The application of linguistics to language teaching.

STATEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE: ALTERNATE

TO: Mr. Lester W. McKim
NDEA Foreign Language Institute
Central Washington State College (HES)
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

☐ I accept the appointment as an alternate candidate in the NDEA Foreign Language Leadership Institute to be held at Central Washington State College from June 20 to August 12, 1966.

☐ I do not accept the appointment as an alternate candidate.

Comments:

Date_____ Signed_____

Soc. Sec. No._____

Home
Address_____

_____

REGISTRATION

Official registration will be held in Anderson Hall on Wednesday, June 22, or Thursday, June 23. (Participants will be roomed at Anderson Hall and most Institute activities will take place there.)

BOARD AND ROOM CHARGES

Room and board for the eight weeks $189.00

See the back of the Anderson Hall suite floor plan sent you with your application forms for additional information.

The initial stipend payment is large enough to facilitate the payment of these costs on June 20.

TRAVEL

No funds are allowable for participants' travel expenses.

Trains from the south and east stop in Ellensburg.

Seattle is a main terminal for air lines. Limousine service is available from the airport to downtown Seattle.

There is Greyhound Bus service between downtown Seattle and Ellensburg . The trip takes about 2½ hours. The bus schedule will be changed in June, and we are unable to get it for you at this time. The one now in effect has buses leaving Seattle for Ellensburg at 9:30 a. m., 11:45 a. m., and 1:15 p. m. The new schedule will also provide fairly frequent service.

PARKING

On-campus parking permits are available at $3.00 per quarter. You may arrange for these after your arrival.

CLOTHING

We hope to have a few hot summer days, but the evenings are always cool, requiring a coat or sweater. Include casual wear for picnics and other informal activities.

INSTITUTE STAFF

According to present plans, the regular Institute staff will reside in Anderson Hall with the participants. There has been one change since the brochure was printed. Instead of Ruth Craig, we shall have Miss Ann Komadina, Director of Foreign Languages, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

May 24, 1966

Dear Participant:

As June 20 rushes at me, I think daily of information which might be useful to you. Somewhere along the line I must leave you to your own devices. I believe that time has arrived. This will be my last general letter. However, if you have questions I shall be happy to answer you individually. Meanwhile, here are some last thoughts that seem relevant:

1. I am enclosing a list of participants. This is the final list - as of May 24.

2. I should like to request your reaction to one last question. You will find a simple questionnaire enclosed. Please return it as soon as possible.

3. There have been questions about the availability of typewriters. We shall have one for our secretary and one in the materials center for our clerical assistant. There is a very limited supply at the local typewriter shop - perhaps six or eight - which should be available at from five to eight dollars per month. If it is handy and you have a typewriter you like, perhaps you will want to bring your own.

4. We shall have a considerable amount of recorded material available for auditing during the Institute. Some will also be available for copying if you feel it would be useful to you personally. We shall have several tape recorders available in the dormitory. However, you may wish to bring some blank tapes and perhaps your own tape recorder as well.

5. A fan is another item which may feel good on some of our summer days.

6. We are exchanging dormitories with the NDEA Poetry Institute. The two dormitories are located side by side, and are identical. Our exchange will make it possible for all participants and staff members to

be housed together. Your summer address will be

NDEA Foreign Language Institute
Anderson Hall
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

7. In case you have not sent a picture, I wish you would do so. I am preparing a special map on which the picture will be posted. This will be of help not only to the staff but to you as well.

Sincerely,

Lester W. McKim
Institute Director

LWM:mdc

Enclosures

1. participant list
2. questionnaire